Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00515 01 OF 02 131746Z

45
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12

H-01 INR-05 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01

PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 /086 W
---------- 055874
P R 131630Z DEC 74
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 789
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0515

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF AD HOC GROUP MEETING
OF DECEMBER 11, 1974

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. AT ITS DEC 11 MEETING, THE AD HOC GROUP (AHG) APPROVED THE US STATEMENT FOR THE DEC 12 PLENARY MEETING (MBFR VIENNA A-46), AS WELL AS A STATEMENT (MBFR VIENNA 502) AND CONTINGENCY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (MBFR VIENNA 501), FOR USE BY THE NETHERLANDS REP AT THE DEC 12 POST-PLENARY ALLIED PRESS CONFERENCE. THE NAC GUIDANCE ON THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL WAS INCLUDED IN THE CONTINGENCY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, BUT NOT IN THE PRESS STATEMENT. THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00515 01 OF 02 131746Z

GROUP ALSO BRIEFLY REVIEWED THE DEC 10 INFORMAL.

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

2. AHG DISCUSSION CENTERED ON THE ISSUE OF WHETHER
NAC GUIDANCE ON THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE
INCLUDED IN THE FINAL PLENARY STATEMENT, WITH THE UK,
FRG, BELGIAN AND CANADIAN REPS FAVORING INCLUSION,
AND THE NETHERLANDS, ITALIAN, DANISH AND US REPS
ARGUING THAT THE GUIDANCE SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN
THE STATEMENT. THE GROUP FINALLY DECIDED AGAINST
INCLUDING THE NAC GUIDANCE, ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT:
(A) THE DEC 12 PLENARY STATEMENT IS NOT A FINAL
WESTERN ANSWER TO THE FREEZE PROPOSAL; (B) A FORMAL
WESTERN RESPONSE SHOULD BE MADE IN A PLENARY; AND (C)
THE ALLIES ARE NOT NECESSARILY BOUD TO AWAIT
CONSIDERED EASTERN REACTIONS, TO THE POINTS IN NAC
GUIDANCE MADE AT THE DEC 10 INFORMAL, BEFORE
PRESENTING A FORMAL REPLY IN PLENARY. END SUMMARY.

WESTERN PLENARY STATEMENT FOR DEC 12

3. AS THE WORKING GROUP COULD NOT AGREE ON WHETHER TO
INCLUDE THE NAC GUIDANCE RESPONDING TO THE EASTERN
FREEZE PROPOSAL IN THE DEC 12 PLENARY STATEMENT, AHG
ATTENTION FOCUSED ON THIS ISSUE.

4. US REP OPENED DISCUSSION BY NOTING THAT THE
ALLIES HAD ALREADY USED THE NAC GUIDANCE AT THE
DEC 10 INFORMAL. EASTERN REPS HAD WELCOMED WESTERN READINESS TO
STUDY THE FREEZE PROPOSAL AND IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE ALLIES
WERE GOING TO HAVE TO DISCUSS IT IN FUTURE INFORMALS.
THE PROBLEM WAS HOW TO DISCUSS IT WITHOUT GETTING
TIED INTO NEGOTIATING ON THE BASIS OF A FREEZE.
US REP SAID HE REALIZED THAT SOME BELIEVE THAT
ANYTHING SAID IN INFORMAL SESSION SHOULD BE REPEATED
IN PLENARY SESSION. HE THOUGHT THIS WAS A
GENERAL PRINCIPLE, BUT THAT IN THIS CASE, IT WOULD
BE ADVERSE TO OUR INTERESTS, SINCE REPEATING THE
GUIDANCE IN PLENARY WOULD ENCORAGE EAST TO KEEP THE
FREEZE AT THE TOP OF THE AGENDA FOR FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS.
US REP POINTED OUT THAT THE GUIDANCE WAS INTENDED
PRIMARILY FOR PUBLIC CONSUMPTION, AND THAT NATO
SECRET

SECRET

HAD ISSUED PRESS GUIDANCE SO THAT ALLIES WOULD BE
ABLE TO RESPOND PUBLICLY TO ANY FUTUREEASTERN PRESS LEAKS. IT
WAS UNNECESSARY TO REPEAT THE NATO GUIDANCE IN PLENARY FOR THAT
PURPOSE. MOREOVER, INCLUSION OF THE GUIDANCE WOULD NOT FIT EASILY
IN WITH THE OVERALL ORGANIZATION AND TRAIN OF THOUGHT OF THE
PLENARY STATEMENT.

5. NETHERLANDS REP (DE VOS) SUPPORTED US REP'S

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

REMARKS, NOTING THAT IT WOULD BE MORE DIFFICULT TO
AVOID NEGOTIATING ON THE BASIS OF A FREEZE IF THE
ALLIES REPEATED THEIR RESPONSE INPLENARY. DE VOS
ALSO ASSERTED THAT OFFICIAL PRESENTATION OF THE
GUIDANCE IN PLENARY COULD PREJUDICE SUBSEQUENT
DEVELOPMENT BY NATO OF A DEFINITIVE ALLIED POSITION.

6. UK REP (ROSE) AGREED THAT THE GUIDANCE DID NOT
EASILY FIT INTO THE PLENARY STATEMENT, BUT NOTED
THAT THE ALLIES ALREADY HAD ADMITTED THEY WERE PRE-
PARED TO DISCUSS THE FREEZE WHEN THEY SAID IN INFORMAL
SESSION THAT THE WEST WAS STUDYING IT. ROSE ARGUED THAT
THE SITUATION WOULD NOT BE CHANGED BY REPEATING THE
ALLIED RESPONSE IN PLENARY. ON THE CONTRARY, REPE-
TITION IN PLENARY SESSION WOULD MAKE THE
ALLIED OBJECTIONS TO THE FREEZE MOREAUTHORITATIVE.
UK REP ALSO SAID THERE WAS A
CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM INVOLVED, SINCE THE NATO
GUIDANCE WAS IN RESPONSE TO A PROPOSAL TABLED IN
PLENARY SESSION AND THE PROPER CHANNEL FOR A REPLY WAS
THE PLENARY SESSION. ROSE ARGUED THAT SOONER OR
LATER THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO RESPOND IN THAT CHANNEL.
ROSE ALSO ARGUED THAT, EVEN IF POLSIH REP STRULAK
DID NOT REVEAL THE FREEZE PROPOSAL IN THE EASTERN
DEC 12 PRESS CONFERENCE, THE EAST WILL DIVULGE IT
DURING THE RECESS. IN THAT CIRCUMSTANCE,
HE THOUGHT AN ALLIED RESPONSE WOULD HAVE MORE PUBLIC
CREDIBILITY IF THE WESTERN OBJECTIONS PREVIOUSLY
HAD BEEN GIVEN IN PLENARY.

7. FRG REP (BEHRENDS) AGREED WITH US REP'S OBJECTIVES
BUT THOUGHT THEY WOULD BE BETTER SERVED IF THE ALLIED
RESPONSE WERE TABLED IN THE DEC 12 PLENRY. IF IT WERE NOT
SECRET

SECRET

INCLUDED IN THE PLENARY STATEMENT, THE ALLIES WOULD
BE EMPHASIZING THE FACT THAT THEY ARE STUDYING THE
PROPOSAL, AND EASTERN EXPECTATIONS OF A POSITIVE
WESTERN RESPONSE WOULD BE ENHANCED. FRG REP SAID
HE PERSONALLY WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE FREEZE PROPOSAL
DIE ON THE VINE, BUT THE PROBLEM IS HOW TO KILL
IT. THE EASTERN REPS HAVE COMMENTED ON THE THREE
ALLIED DIFFICULTIES WITH THE FREEZE, SO THE BALL WAS NOW
IN ALLIED COURT. THE ALLIES ARE EXPECTED BY THE EAST TO
RESPOND IN JAN. BEHRENDS THOUGHT THAT, TACTICALLY,
IT WOULD BE BETTER TO REPEAT THE THREE DIFFICULTIES
IN THE DEC 12 PLENARY, AND SAY THAT THE ALLIES NOW
AWAIT A CONSIDERED EASTERN RESPONSE. MOREOVER,
BEHRENDS DOUBTED THAT NAC WOULD BE ABLE TO DEVELOP
A MORE DEFINITE ALLIED POSITION ON THE FREEZE IN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

TIME FOR USE AT THE OPENING PLENARY OF THE FIFTH
ROUND ON JAN 30.

8. US DEP REP STRESSED THAT THE NAC GUIDANCE WAS
OF AN INTERIM CHARACTER, SO NEED NOT BE INCLUDED IN
THE PLENARY STATEMENT. HE THOUGHT WESTERN PARLIA-
MENTS COULD ACCEPT IN GOOD FAITH THE ASSURANCES
OF THEIR NATIONAL REPS THAT THE ALLIES HAD CONVEYED
THE NATO GUIDANCE TO THE EAST WITHOUT IT BEING TABLED
IN PLENARY. HE DOUBTED THAT PARLIAMENTS WERE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00515 02 OF 02 131810Z

45
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12

H-01 INR-05 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01

PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 /086 W
---------- 056241
P R 131630Z DEC 74
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 790
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0515

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS
FROM US REP MBFR

INTERESTED IN THE EXACT MODALITIES OF SUCH
RESPONSES. NETHERLANDS REP ENDORSED THESE REMARKS.
ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) SAID THAT WHILE HE HAD PRE-
VIOUSLY WANTED TO REPEAT THE GUIDANCE IN PLENARY,
THESE REMARKS HAD CHANGED HIS MIND. HE THOUGHT THE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

ALLIED NEEDED A CONSIDERED RESPONSE FROM NATO BEFORE
TABLING THE GUIDANCE IN PLENARY.

9. BELGIAN ACTING REP (WILLOT) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES
WERE DEFINITELY IN FAVOR OF INCLUDING NATO GUIDANCE
IN THE DEC 12 PLENARY STATEMENT. HE ARGUED THAT THE PLENARY
IS THE OFFICIAL FORUM OF THE NEGOTIATIONS AND
THEREFORE THE ALLIES HAD DEVELOPED THE PRACTICE
OF REPEATING POSITIONS IN PLENARY. WILLOT ACKNOW-
LEDGED THAT THE ALLIES USUALLY ALLOW A LAPSE OF
SECRET

SECRET

SOME WEEKS BEFORE REPEATING POSITIONS IN
PLENARY, BUT ARGUED THT IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO DO
SO THIS TIME, AS THAT WOULD DELAY A PLENARY RESPONSE
UNTIL FEBURARY, LEAVING THE EAST UNCERTAIN OF THE
ALLIED POSITION DURING THE RECESS. FURTHERMORE, ALLIES
COULD BE FACED WITH A PRESS CAMPAIGN DURING THE RECESS,
IN WHICH CASE ALLIES WOULD BE FORCED TO
DRAW ON A POSITION USED ONLY IN INFORMAL SESSION.
THIS WOULD RISK BREAKING THE CONFIDENTIALITY RULE.

10. US DEP REP POINTED OUT ALLIES HAD INDICATED THEY
WERE NOT SATISFIED WITH THE PRELIMINARY EASTERN
RESPONSE AND THAT ALLIES WANT A CONSIDERED RESPONSE
FROM EASTERN AUTHORITIES. THEREFORE, THE EAST
ALREADY OWES THE ALLIES A REPLY IN JANUARY. THERE
WAS NO NEED FOR ALLIES TO MAKE A FURTHER REACTION UNTIL
THE EAST HAD GIVEN ONE. IN THIS CASE, REPEATING THE
GUIDANCE IN PLENARY WAS SUPERFLUOUS. FRG REP ASKED
IF EAST UNDERSTOOD THE MEANING OF "CONSIDERED RESPONSE."
US DEP REP SAID THAT IF THE EAST DOES NOT, THE ALLIES
COULD EXPLAIN IT. UK REP DOUBTED THIS TACTIC WOULD WORK,
SINCE THE EAST COULD SAY THEY ARE WAITING FOR RESULTS
OF ALLIED STUDY OF THE FREEZE. US DEP REP ARGUED THAT
ALLIES DID NOT OWE THE EAST A DEFINITIVE ANSWER UNTIL
THE EAST REPLIED TO THE THREE CITED ALLLIED PROBLEMS.
OBVIOUSLY, ALLIES COULD NOT CONCLUDE THE STUDY UNTIL THEY
HAVE CONSIDERED EASTERN REACTION.

11. CANADIAN ACTING REP (MORGAN) ARGUED THAT IF ALLIES
DON'T REPEAT GUIDANCE IN PLENARY, EAST WILL BE LESS
THAN SURE OF WESTERN GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION. ALSO,IT
WOULD SHOW THAT THE ALLIES WERE DIVIDED. IF EAST LEAKED
THE PROPOSAL, ALLIES WOULD BE IN BETTER POSITION IF
RESPONSE WERE ON PLENARY RECORD. US DEP REP POINTED
OUT THAT NATO HAD GIVEN GUIDANCE FOR PRESS PURPOSES.

12. US REP SAID THAT THE ISSUE INVOLVED APPEARED TO
BE MORE A TACTICAL QUESTION THAN A CONSTITUTIONAL

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

ONE. THE ALLIES HAD SAID IN THE DEC 10 INFORMAL
THAT THEIR RESPONSE WAS AN OFFICIAL ONE.
REPETITION IN PLENARY WAS NOT NECESSARY TO MAKE IT
SECRET

SECRET

OFFICIAL. ON THE CONTRARY, REPEATING THE SAME WORDS
WOUD SIGNAL THAT ALLIES WERE DIVIDED. IF ALLIES
DO NOT HAVE FURTHER GUIDANCE IN JAN, ALLIES COULD
SIMPLY REPEAT THE GUIDANCE OR ASK FOR GUIDANCE FROM
NATO. SINCE ALLIES ARE NOW LOCKED INTO A SET OF
WORDS WITH NO FLEXIBILITY, IT WAS BETTER TO STAND ON
THE DEC 10 PRESENTATION. BELGIAN ACTING REP ARGUED
IT WOULD NOT BE THE FIRST TIME THAT ALLIES HAD REPEATED
VERBATIM IN PLENARY WHAT THEY HAD SAID IN THE INFORMAL.
NATO GUIDANCE PROVIDES AN OFFICIAL RESPONSE AND THERE-
FORE SHOULD BE CONVEYED TO THE EAST IN PLENARY FORUM.
WILLOT SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WERE VERY FIRM
ON THIS POINT.

13. UK REP SAID HE SYMPATHIZED WITH WILLOT'S CONCERN
BUT WAS NOT CONVINCED BY BEHRENDS' TACTICAL ARGUMENTS.
ROSE SAID HE COULD GO ALONG WITH NOT REPEATING NATO
GUIDANCE IN THE DEC 12 PLENARY, SUBJECT TO THREE
UNDERSTANDINGS: (A) THE DEC 12PLENARY STATEMENT IS
NOT TO BE CONSIDERED WITHIN THE AHG AS A FINAL WESTERN
ANSWER TO THE FREEZE PROPOSAL; (B) A PLENARY
MEETING IS THE PROPER FORUM FOR A DEFINITIVE REPLY TO
A FORMAL EASTERN PROPOSAL, AND AT SOME POINT A FORMAL
WESTERN RESPONSE SHOULD BE MADE IN PLENARY; AND (C)
THE ALLIES ARE NOT NECESSARILY OBLIGED TO AWAIT
EASTERN REACTIONS, TO THE POINTS IN NAC
GUIDANCE MADE AT THE DEC 10 INFORMAL, BEFORE PRESENTING
A FORMAL REPLY IN PLENARY.

14. AFTER FURHTER DISCUSSION, THE GROUP AGREED TO
THESE UNDERSTANDINGS AND THEREFORE AGREED
THAT THE NAC GUIDANCE ON THE FREEZE WOULD NOT RPT NOT
BE INCLUDED IN THE DEC 12 US PLENARY STATEMENT. THE
GROUP THEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED THE TEXT OF THE PLENARY
STATEMENT. THE ONLY SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES WERE MADE BY
THE FRG REP, TO TONE DOWN TWO PASSAGES WHICH SAID THE
ONLY GOAL OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WAS TO SEEK MILITARILY
SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTIONS. BEHRENDS WANTED TO ENSURE
THAT THE STATEMENT DID NOT IMPLY ALLIED UNWILLINGNESS
TO CONSIDER A FREEZE.RESOR

SECRET

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

NNN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: REPORTS, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, MILITARY CAPABILITIES, PRESS RELEASES, FOREIGN POLICY PO SITION
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 DEC 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974MBFRV00515
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740362-1049
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741237/aaaabfli.tel
Line Count: 325
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <28 MAR 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <28 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF AD HOC GROUP MEETING OF DECEMBER 11, 1974
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005